

<b>I.</b>	<b>SUMMARY OF REPLY COMMENTS</b>	<b>Page 1</b>
<b>II.</b>	<b>THE PRIMARY LINE PROPOSALS ARE CONTRARY TO LAW, UNWORKABLE AND UNNECESSARY</b>	<b>Page 2</b>
	<b>A. The Primary Line And Capping Proposals Provide Insufficient Support To Maintain And Construct Rural Telecommunications Networks.</b>	<b>Page 2</b>
	<b>B. The Primary Line And Capping Proposals Violate The Provisions Of The Act And Are Unlawful.</b>	<b>Page 3</b>
	1. The Proposals Violate Section 254(b) (1) Of The Act	<b>Page 3</b>
	2. The Proposals Violate Section 254(b) (2) Of The Act.	<b>Page 4</b>
	3. The Proposals Violate Section 254(b) (3) Of The Act.	<b>Page 5</b>
	4. The Proposals Violate Section 254(b) (5) Of The Act.	<b>Page 5</b>
	5. The Proposals Violate The Acts Public Interest Requirement For Rural LECs.	<b>Page 5</b>
	6. The Primary Line And Capping Proposals Must Be Rejected By The Commission.	<b>Page 6</b>
	<b>C. The Primary Line Proposals Are Administratively Unworkable.</b>	<b>Page 6</b>
<b>III.</b>	<b>THE PRIMARY LINE AND CAPPING PROPOSALS ARE UNNECESSARY IF APPROPRIATE ETC DESIGNATION REQUIREMENTS ARE ADOPTED</b>	<b>Page 8</b>
	<b>A. Standardized Minimum ETC Criteria That Are Evaluated In Fact Intensive And Rigorous ETC Designation Process Must Be Adopted.</b>	<b>Page 8</b>
	1. That it has adequate financial resources in order to provide quality services throughout the designated service area.	<b>Page 8</b>
	2. Its commitment and ability to provide services throughout the designated service area to all customers who make a reasonable request for service; Its commitment to use the funding it receives only to support infrastructure within the designated service area; and That its designation will not result in cream-skimming by allowing the applicant to serve only the low-cost, high revenue customers in the designated service area.	<b>Page 9</b>
	3. Its ability to remain functional in emergency situations.	<b>Page 10</b>

4. The Impact of its designation on the USF. The State Commission or FCC must consider the impact on the growth of the fund.	Page 10
5. That it will abide by consumer protection requirements imposed by State Commissions or the Commission.	Page 11
B. Additional Minimum ETC Criteria Are Required In Order To Insure A Rigorous and Fact Intensive ETC Designation Analysis And To Insure That The ETC Designation Is In The Public Interest.	Page 11
1. Applicant claims that there will be increased competition and that the advantages of the ETC designation outweigh the disadvantages must be verified.	Page 12
2. The Applicant Must Be Required To Provide Equal Access.	Page 13
3. A Specified Amount Of Local Usage Must Be Provided.	Page 13
4. The Commission(s) Should Evaluate Whether Additional ETCs (primarily wireless carriers) Have A Cost-Based Need For Support.	Page 16
5. Minute Of Use Blocking Is Necessary For All Per-Minute Charges, Not Just For Toll Charges.	Page 17
6. Customer Service Agreements Requiring Payment of Termination Penalties Should Not Be Allowed For Universal Service Offerings.	Page 18
C. Summary of Proposed Minimum ETC Criteria.	Page 18
IV. ASSERTIONS MADE BY A NUMBER OF COMMENTERS ARE INCORRECT	Page 20
1. Universal Service Support Is Not Intended By The Act To Be Used To Artificially Insert Competition Into Rural Areas.	Page 21
2. ETC Designation Requirements Are Not A Barrier To Entry And Do Not Restrict Competitive Entry.	Page 22
3. The Commissions Have The Authority Under The Act To Impose Additional ETC Designation Requirements In Rural LEC Service Areas.	Page 23
4. Multiple ETC Designations In Rural LEC Areas Are Unsustainable And Must Be Limited	Page 23